Commerce Information Technology Review Board
Evaluation Sheet

Operating Unit:	
Office:	
Project Name:	
Life Cycle Costs:	
FY 2002 Costs:	
Operating Unit Ranking:	
Project Description:	

	Score 0 (lowest)-----10 (highest)	**Weighted Score** (Score x weight)
1. Basis for Investment (4X):	_____	_____
2. Program Management (2X):	_____	_____
3. Risks (2X):	_____	_____
4. Architecture (1X):	_____	_____
5. Secretarial/Departmental Initiatives (1X):	_____	_____
Total Score:		_____

Summary Comments/Scoring Rationale:

Name of evaluator:_____Phone#_____

Operating Unit:_____Date_____

Evaluation Criteria

General

To receive full credit (10 points) each category should have adequately satisfied each of the stated criteria. Each of the 5 categories has a maximum of 10 points and a weight factor of 1X to 4X. The category, *Basis for Investment*, has the highest weight, 4X, because this category is the driving force for approving the investment. The maximum number of weighted points for the project is 100.

The evaluation methodology assumes all investments must meet the same criteria to be approved. If a determination is made that an evaluation criterion is not applicable (NA), a score of A5" should be entered to promote consistency and avoid penalizing the project. The evaluator should also use professional judgement as to the right level of documentation for each project. We do not expect an R&D project to have as rigorous a system of development standards as a production system, or a small investment to have an extensive benefit cost analysis.

1. Basis for Investment (Weight: 4X)

Criteria:

Summary of benefits, tangible and non-tangible, including return-on-investment (ROI) and benefit-cost analysis.

Consideration of all the alternatives and benefits, including outsourcing.

Support of operating unit≡s (OU≡s) missions and goals.

High rating from internal OU evaluation process.

Scoring:

Highest scores (8-10) - The project has a documented and approved benefit-cost analysis that is consistent with the methodology described in Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-130; all the alternatives and benefits are addressed; the selected alternative has a high value (ROI) for the Government and supports the mission and goals of the OU; and a project is rated high by the OU evaluation process. The OU should have a benefit-cost analysis on file and be able to produce it on demand if requested.

Medium scores (5-7) - The project has a cost analysis instead of a benefit-cost analysis; other alternatives exist; the project is rated medium priority by the OU; the project may not be the best alternative selected; and the project has less formal documentation.

Low scores (0-4) - There is no cost analysis; the documentation weakly support OU goals and mission.

2. Program Management (Weight: 2X)

Criteria:

A description of how the project will be managed.

A system to monitor cost, schedule, and performance and report on deviations.

The experience of the OU with projects of this size, scope, and complexity.

Scoring:

High scores (8-10) - OU has a formal and established system to manage and track development and performance; the project has good performance measurements; OU personnel assigned to the project have experience and a good track record in projects of this size and scope.

Medium scores (5-7) - OU has an informal or proposed system to manage and track development and performance; overall, OU organization has experience and a good track record in developing systems.

Low scores (0-4) - OU does not have a system to manage and track development and performance; OU personnel lack experience in system development.

3. **Risk Management (Weight: 2X)**

   Criteria:

   Key project risks and a description of how they will be mitigated, including use of a modular approach.

   A description of how the acquisition strategy will manage procurement risks.

   Security measures.

   Use of commercial-off-the-shelf products.

   Scoring:

   High score (8-10) - all the risks, including security, are identified and can be managed; the acquisition approach is well defined and is manageable; the project is developed in a modular approach, where possible; the project uses commercial-off-the-shelf hardware and software; risks and approach are formally documented. (Note: Not all projects are candidates for a modular approach.)

   Medium scores (5-7) - Most but not all risks are identified or manageable; the project does not use a modular approach and creates risk.

   Low score (0-4) -   The project has no risk analysis; there are identified risks that could prevent the investment from being successful.

4. **Architectural Compliance (Weight: 1X)**

   Criteria:

   A description of how the project is compliant with the OU≡s IT architecture and technical infrastructure.

   A description of the use of commercial-off-the-shelf products.

   Scoring:

   High scores (8-10) - OU has a documented architecture and this project≡s proposed architecture is compatible with the OU≡s architecture; a description of the current architecture and the target architecture is provided and shows how this project fits in.

Medium scores (5-7) - OU does not have an architecture but the project has an architecture.

Low scores (0-4) - Neither the OU nor the project has addressed architecture; however, the project application/system is described.

5. **Secretarial/Departmental Goals and Initiatives (Weight: 1X)**

   Criteria:

   Support for Secretarial/Departmental initiatives, e.g, the Digital Department initiative, use of the Internet or other interface technology, or support of accessibility requirements.

   Scoring:

   High scores (8-10) - The project directly supports Secretarial/Departmental initiatives.

   Medium scores (5-7) - The project provides partial support for Secretarial/Departmental initiatives.

   Low scores (0-4) -The project indirectly supports Secretarial/Departmental initiatives.